



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE THURSDAY, MAY 18, 2006 Special Meeting

Members present: Leo Dierckman, Mark Rattermann, Steve Stromquist, Madeleine Torres, Susan Westermeier.

DOCS representatives: Director Mike Hollibaugh; Matt Griffin; Christine Barton-Holmes; Intern Nathan Anderson; John Molitor, Legal Counsel.

The Special Studies Committee considered the following items:

1. Docket No. 06030024 DP Amend/ADLS: Carmel Family Physicians

The applicant seeks approval for the construction of a medical office building.

The site is located at 310 Medical Drive and is zoned B-8.

Filed by Mike Armstrong of Shamrock Builders for Carmel Family Physicians.

Matt Skelton, attorney, Bingham, McHale, 970 Logan Street, Noblesville appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also present: Dr. Stephen Lang, Dr. Daniel Crab, Dr. Rice Jones; Scott Bordenay, project engineer; Robert Carrter, Shamrock Builders.

The site is being re-developed following destruction by fire of the previous facility. The doctors have temporarily relocated in the Michigan Road corridor and that has created quite a bit of inconvenience for their patients.

There were a handful of concerns expressed at the Plan Commission meeting on the 16th of May. Hopefully, those concerns will be addressed this evening. A revised site plan was submitted. The elevations were revised in response to architectural issues raised by the Department Staff. The roofline has been lowered and the dormers enlarged in order to enhance the appearance of the structure.

The dumpster enclosure has been angled so that it is not the first structure you see upon entering the site; the dumpster is located in the southwest corner of the site.

There was a concern raised regarding the configuration of the entrance drive—the island delineates traffic flow for safety reasons. The landscaping has been supplemented by screening the dumpster enclosure and the tree at the island entrance.

Dr. Lang addressed the Committee. Family Care Physicians has 15 employees. Part of the expansion of the building was to allow room for St. Vincent Primary Care to lease space from Family Care. St. Vincent would take up an additional 15 employees—making a total of 30 employees. At any one time, there could be a maximum of 7 doctors working in the building. Patients could number 21 at any given time for a total of 51 parking spaces. The 6 additional parking spaces were felt to be crucial to the convenience of the patients and the staff. Currently, 53 parking spaces are shown on the plan—47 are required.

Leo Dierckman suggested re-positioning the dumpster perpendicular to the building. There should be a definite path to the building from the parking lot.

Matt Griffin commented that the sidewalk will be at the right-of-way and will straddle the setback line. It should be noted that there is a very large Tulip Tree on site that the Urban Forester would like to see preserved. The City Engineer's intention is to ring the dry detention with rip-wrap—the Department would rather see it with a stone wall that would give more volume in a smaller area. It could be that the drainage structure could be “shored-up.”

Matt Skelton said that it would necessary to remove the Tulip Tree with the configuration of the site; the petitioner is planting 18 additional trees on the site. The Tulip Tree may not survive the stress of site work with heavy construction equipment. Also, if the Tulip remains, the parking spaces would be reduced by 4 spaces.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to grant final approval of **Docket No. 06030024 DP Amend/DLS: Carmel Family Physicians**, with commitments in place for parking and sidewalk from the building to the right-of-way, seconded by Steve Stromquist, **Approved 5-0**.

2. Docket No: 05120025 Z 126th & Keystone/Gramercy PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 116 acres from R2/Residential and R4/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of townhouse, apartment, retail, and office uses.

The site is located between Carmel Drive, 126th Street, Keystone Ave, and Auman Dr. Filed by James Shinaver of Nelson & Frankenberger for Buckingham Properties Inc.

Jim Shinaver, attorney, Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: David Leazenby, Brad Chamber, and Sara Nasuti, Buckingham Properties; Gary Murray, civil engineer.

David Leazenby addressed the Committee. The use area was modified so that the first two rows are Area A, the second two rows are Area B, the balance of the area is for the core; same thing with the height—35 feet for the first two rows, 50 feet for the second two rows, and 100 feet in the core area.

Previously, there was discussion regarding the corner of 126th & Keystone—whether it will be

S:\PlanCommission\Minutes\Committees\SpecialStudies\2006may18specialmtg

residential or non-residential. Some text has been put into the Ordinance so that anything proposed for non-residential would be a Special Use, denoted on the matrix as “SU,” so that anything that is not an apartment or “for sale residential” would have to come before a hearing officer, BZA, etc. This also applies to the area east of the existing entrance moving toward Keystone in Area A and Area B.

Regarding access—at present, 50% of the property can be developed as it is; the remaining property can be developed once one of the access points is obtained; whether that is to the south onto Carmel Drive, or out to Keystone.

The setbacks have been changed at the request of the Committee so that they are more consistent around the perimeter and 15 feet from the property line. From the edge of the road that ultimately would be developed on Auman Drive, there would be about 30 feet of separation between the pavement and the beginning of the Gramercy property line. (30 feet plus 15) It is assumed that there will be improvements to Auman Drive within the right-of-way.

Leo then asked how close the first building would be to the actual edge of the pavement—the revised edge of pavement)

Gary Murray, engineer responded that there would be about 16 feet from the back of the sidewalk.

Mike Hollibaugh calculated that with a 5-foot sidewalk, plus a 5 or 6-foot wide tree lawn, plus the curb, plus another foot—(14 or 15 feet) plus the 15-foot setback—the approximate total would be a 30-foot setback.

David Leazenby said that the traffic language has been narrowed down, (page 8., tab 2.) Clarification has been added regarding the route construction traffic would take as it relates to the residential neighborhood. Beyond that, some structural changes have been made to the Ordinance as it relates to platting and landscape design guidelines.

Leo asked that the petitioner go over the List of Permitted Uses—it was determined that there were no changes to the list and it is shown as it was at the last meeting. So that everyone is aware: A Special Use would require a public hearing process through the Board of Zoning Appeals.

The Committee and petitioner then reviewed the red-line version of the proposed Ordinance on a page-by-page basis.

It was determined that some of the exhibits to the Ordinance were distributed at previous meetings, and due to the absence of some of the Committee members, not everyone had a full proposal for review.

Matt Griffin went over the platting process for the benefit of the project and what it means to the

S:\PlanCommission\Minutes\Committees\SpecialStudies\2006may18specialmtg

3

project. Platting is more ownership than design. A single family project is seen as a development plan and ADLS and would have a public hearing. In terms of cutting up individual lots or splitting off individual units of townhomes, DOCS would do that administratively after the development plan was approved and had public hearing. Basically, the public and the Dept. would have an opportunity for comments regarding design, number of units, etc. through the Plan Commission process. After approval, the Dept. would have the power to create the physical lot lines for those houses to be sold off. There would not be a separate, administrative review for new projects—the public would have an opportunity for comment at the Plan Commission level.

Jim Shinaver mentioned the definition in the Carmel Zoning Ordinance for a plat and the review process for the Development Plan. As discussed all along, the petition is for a rezone, showing the conceptual site plan—when the petitioner returns for a particular section or area, the process for Development Plan approval would have to be followed and that is a public hearing process. Some slight changes have occurred to the language in platting to allow for possible interpretation of being required to plat—there may be some situations that would not require platting, but that particular portion of the development would still require going through the development plan approval process—a public hearing; this has been clarified in section 3. The corresponding language in the ordinance for later review, again, illustrates or requires that the petitioner must go through the Development Plan and ADLS approval subsequent to the development of any section and that is a Plan Commission public hearing process.

Leo noted that Use Area A is 100% Residential; Use Area B—the next layer in—is 70% Residential; Area C is a minimum of 50% Residential.

David Leazenby noted that there are height restrictions along with limits on the parking ratio—no residential unit can be sold without a covered parking space.

Mark Rattermann asked if the petitioner were willing to put a cap on the commercial space in area C (the document reads “No more than 50% of the gross floor area built in Area C.”)

The petitioner believes commercial space will be no more than 200,000 square feet on the entire site. The traffic study shows 2 to 300,000 over the whole site, concentrated on the southern portion of the site where there will be the most access, if the access is granted. The petitioner had not put a cap on the commercial but was willing to entertain the idea.

Mark Rattermann asked whether or not the petitioner was willing to put a cap on the number of living units in this project—David Leazenby responded that it was not appropriate to do that.

Following a discussion regarding the differences between a Rezone and the PUD proposal, the specificity in the proposed PUD, and extent of informational materials, Mark Rattermann excused himself from the meeting.

Matt Griffin suggested that the petitioner put together a master pack for the next Committee meeting.

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

Page 4., Section D of the Ordinance: Language will be included to provide that any Special Use approval would go before the BZA and then return to the Plan Commission for DP/ADLS approval. Note: The Development Plan is part of the public hearing process and would require public notice under the Rules of Procedure.

Leo Dierckman commented that this process could be expanded now—the Plan Commission could ask that the list be broadened to provide for a “public notice ring” around the entire project so that anytime anything happens within the bounds, residents within the “ring” will be directly noticed—certified mail, not newspaper publication, and beyond the 660 feet or 2 owners deep notice ring would be by first class, regular mail rather than certified.

Madeleine Torres asked about the building height—Matt Griffin said that it should be hashed out by the BZA.

Page 5—no objection.

Page 6—Language was added for clarification—streets could be either public or private. There would be no residential unit or even commercial that would only be accessible by a private drive—it would be a public right-of-way.

Page 7—Parking is intending to meet the current ordinance in terms of required numbers. The petitioner will look at and determine the numbers.

Page 8—there is concern with routing the construction traffic—Auman Drive cannot be used for construction traffic unless the petitioner went before the Board of Public Works to request that.

John Molitor commented that construction traffic would not be allowed on Auman Drive unless the Board of Public Works told them they had to go there—the Board of Works would rule.

David Leazenby referred to a sentence in the PUD—The developer shall make its best reasonable efforts to avoid routing construction traffic through residential neighborhoods. This sentence could be made stronger.

John Molitor felt that the language was pretty strong concerning construction traffic and residential neighborhoods.

Page 9, 10, 11—no changes

Design and Development Standards

Page 5, connectivity language included in section 1.2—will say sidewalks and pathways.

Page 6—the petitioner stated that the amount of acreage for parks and green space is 6.55 acres; however, that is not the only greenspace on site. There is other greenspace in and around the buildings as you get into the final design of different blocks. These are the general, larger park

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

locations. The petitioner will stipulate the amount for parks and will commit to the 6.55 acreage for parks and green space.

David Leazenby said the petitioner would commit to the 6.55 acres for parks and green space; Brad Chambers concurred. The petitioner is required under the Design Guidelines to install parks.

Madeleine Torres asked that the larger parks be further defined—a certain percentage set aside for active play area—the petitioner agreed.

Matt Griffin requested a list of generic amenities included in the park areas.

Page 7—Leo was concerned with shielding of lighting so that there is no light spillage on the adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Matt Griffin stated that the current Ordinance does require shielding of lighting, although there is no blanket for the City. The best practice in any project seen for the last several years would require 100% cut-off lights to keep lights downcast and not out—this would exclude wallpacks on buildings and street lighting. The intention is to have low light posts and lights that cast downward, onto the site. Again, the current Ordinance does not have an overall lighting standard. A statement could be included in the PUD regarding light fixtures and lighting—dark sky initiative friendly—some such thing.

David Leazenby stated that the light standards in the original brochure give more clarity to the lighting being discussed.

Page 8, 9—Landscaping—currently, the petitioner is tied to the landscape plan that was approved for Mohawk Hills. If there are trees out there that are not on the plan, the petitioner is free to remove them. Currently the petitioner is working with Scott Brewer; there may be some minor text changes to the landscape section.

Page 10—no changes

Page 11 explains further in language what is in the design package.

Page 12—in any situation, a minimum of 5 feet sidewalk width.

Section 1.82—Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation, should perhaps include bicycle parking or access—refer to current Carmel Bicycle Parking Ordinance.

David Leazenby said there is a requirement for bicycle racks in primary public spaces and retail areas.

Christine Holmes referred to the current Bicycle Parking Ordinance—there are standards for the
S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

6

number of racks based on the number of parking spaces; the location of the racks are in relation to the front of the building. The petitioner will look at the situation.

Page 13, 14, 15—no changes

Page 16: further embellishments, pictures, etc.

Page 18—wood decking and wood handrails are allowed only in the rear of buildings—this language was removed. Christine Holmes explained that there are certain architectural styles where wooden handrails at the front of a building would be appropriate such as a Queen Anne or Victorian-style house.

Page 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, no changes.

Page 24—Madeleine Torres recalled lettering on an outdoor umbrella table that had to come before the Committee for ADLS. The Committee agreed that language such as “Decorative material as approved by the Commission” would be acceptable.

Item 2.64—Awnings are to be higher to provide for clear pedestrian passage below.

Page 25—no change.

Public Input:

Angie Molt, representing Auman & Newark Additions, asked that the Committee take a long hard look at this project and the commercial aspect. The 20-year projection for Auman & Newark to be “Urbanized” is unreasonable. The only commercial from the point on US 31 and Keystone to 96th Street is a business B-8 that abuts on one little corner of the Gramercy south property line is Merchants Pointe, already vacant stores within. The area is primarily low intensity, low density, R-1, R-2, R-4, S-1 and S-2. As for the Gramercy 116-acre property, it is equal to 56 of the homes in Auman & Newark and the proposal is for 2,000 townhomes, 700 apartments, 85,000 square feet of business, and 50,000 square feet of retail (figures taken from the traffic study.) This is over 20 units per acre, averaged, and is an unreasonable project to impose in the middle of a low-intensity residential neighborhood—Keystone has always been referred to as a residential roadway.

Regarding the PUD and Proposed Residential Uses: “A multiple-family dwelling shall contain per site units, the number of units per building shall be limited to 5.” Ms. Molt circulated pictures of a development showing 5 units at 38 feet—the proposal does not address setbacks or sideyards or the density in this area. The current buildings in Mohawk do not meet the definition of a 30-foot building. What is being termed “transition” is bigger than anything they have and by no means phases from Auman/Newark residential area. The residents on Auman East will not see the sunrise because the top of the buildings in Gramercy will block it. In the Gramercy proposal, they are requesting “flexibility” in orienting the buildings in order to maximize some exposure.

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

7

The platting: Ms. Molt pointed out the small size of the parks set aside for 140 units; the percentage of greenspace actually computes to 5.6%. The only place that addresses setbacks is on the outer edges—setbacks for Keystone—residential must be 30 feet, businesses and commercial setback must be 120 feet. The petitioner is picking and choosing what will be adhered to for the Ordinance. “If it meets the program, we will use it; otherwise, we will throw it out the window.” The zoning ordinances are to protect the 200 homes within the neighboring subdivisions.

The volume of traffic that this project will produce into Auman will have a definite impact on the residents. The proposal is to offset the streets—the streets jog with the opposite side of the street that do not come through—there is no security factor in that. Gramercy will generate so much traffic that the City will have no choice but to put roads through or the residents are made miserable. Which is it going to be? Nothing should be developed on the site until an additional access is approved and no road should open onto Auman or Newark Addition. We only have two ways out: Shoshone and 126th Street that is an odd, three-way stop. The traffic study says 50 cars during prime time—do the math—let’s eliminate this. We don’t want this through our neighborhood.

100-foot buildings—Is that appropriate for this area? How many 100-foot buildings are on Meridian Street? (none-named) The current 20-20 Plan protects the residents; the residents’ needs are first and foremost. It is understood that there is a need for change, but it must be done responsibly. If you are looking at 20 years out—go ahead and zone this with lower heights, come back in ten-15 years when this is built up and it needs to go higher because the Auman/Newark neighborhood will have progressed and you would see what the ramification has been. You have to be able to fill this and use it. There is a reason that Mom & Pop grocery stores are not around, they work for a while and people get tired of the novelty and then they do not work.

You have to think about traffic—will the development pull traffic into the area, will it push traffic out? Either one of those affects the Auman/Newark neighborhood. When you pick the uses, make sure they do not generate traffic. Live/work units are fine as long as they do not pull traffic in. Do you really want the guy that just needs 50 copies running through your neighborhood while your kids are outside? A representative of Buckingham had stated that Auman Drive was not slated for improvements—it was a surprise hearing that this evening. Auman Addition had 60-foot setbacks at the time of construction—the setbacks were changed by Carmel in 2001. Do we have to put a turn-around in so that we can come out face forward? As for improvements to the neighborhood, we don’t need sidewalks right now because we are quiet, even with the slight increased traffic we get—we just don’t need them. But, you open up one road and that will require sidewalks in the neighborhood because we all walk.

As read, the proposed PUD seeks to be exempt from the zoning unless specifically referred to—they want the PUD to do everything for them—what is holding them accountable? Do I have to spend the next 10 years here every time you want to do something or can’t we make this detailed

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

enough that I can go ahead and enjoy my life—this is getting ridiculous! As the proposal stands today, I would say “No Dice.” It would be the ruination not only of our neighborhood but The Enclave would suffer, Wilson would suffer and Concord Village would suffer. The minute Cool Creek Subdivision opens their eyes, they will realize what is going to happen to them too.

Angie Molt asked that as this PUD is hammered out, that she be given ample time and notice to prepare. Ms. Molt said she had pulled up the State Code and read the PUD—it says the proposal is to provide detail! There must be some accountability to someone at some time or every single homeowner in Carmel is in trouble. The PUD must be detailed enough or with specific enough design—in other words, in the paper work, is there a picture of a 100-foot building?

David Leazenby responded that the tallest structure is the clock tower at 95 feet. An eight-story building would be close to 100 feet.

Angie Molt continued: If you don’t plat now for some provision for some type of specificity in these quadrants, I am stuck coming to these meetings for 10 years! To live in Carmel, should I have to work that hard? I honestly don’t think so—it is an unreasonable expectation. We were told that we could place a contingency on this project being started before anything is opened up on Keystone and Carmel Drive and that opened a new can of worms to “Now we can do this percentage before opening, the traffic study says we can.” There must be some assurance that nothing gets developed until there is a cut made at least onto Carmel Drive—Keystone might take a little longer. No opening should come into Auman Addition until Keystone and Carmel Drive are opened; Auman and 126th Street should be built up first to ensure the residents’ safety. The project should be contingent upon the road coming out at Shoshone—there should be only three openings, strictly for the safety of the Auman/Newark residents.

Another question: Since you are wanting to build new, is there an erasure of old that will be remodeled so that we are not stuck with old buildings in the long run. In other words, is there anything in place to make sure the property does get fully redeveloped—if you leave my nightmare there, what good is it other than you are adding traffic and annoyance.

To give you an idea of the dimensions of this property: The north property line is 1,977.5 feet; the west property line is 2,198 feet; the south property line is 1,817 feet, and the commercial is on 1160 feet of that—that is the only boundary you have on Carmel’s business district. East Auman or east property line Keystone is 2,675 feet. This is not huge—to increase the density, if you really are primarily residential and the building height is 35 feet in these areas, why not keep it zoned R-4 and R-2 and just add Special Uses to accommodate the deli and coffee shops until some of this can be ironed out. That way, you can move forward with our protection being under the zoning.

One of the things about zoning is that it gives you front yards, side yards, aggregates of side yards, rear yards, minimum lot widths, ground floor area—it gives you things you can work with. I have some security knowing what is going to be next door to me. I know I don’t have to attend the meeting if these guys adhere to the criteria. What you are asking for is basically an

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

9

open ticket and that is not reasonable on something this size.

The only concern about streets is if they are wide enough for safety. It is unknown how they decide where fire trucks and ambulances run—I sincerely hope that eliminating Shoshone, it will never be through my neighborhood. In a project as large as what is being proposed, do we have the fire protection for 100-foot tall buildings? Does the City need to reinvest? Do we have the police coverage for the number of units proposed—do we have the proper fire coverage? There is no other PUD in Carmel such as the one being proposed of this size. It may be that they are farther along in the process and this will get there—that is my hope. At the start of this section, it says it is located adjacent to the Carmel Business District—this is misleading—Hunters Glen is on the corner and the little area next to it is the Business District. Item 3 says it does not pass through any low intensity residential areas; any opening on this passes through my area and has no other choice! There must be some table in the current Comprehensive Plan that says you cannot put high density next to low density residential—it does say that, and that is for a reason. We need to consider this—we really need to consider a transition and end the whole size of this project.

Section II, page 3, paragraph 2. Green spaces are no longer linked and it still does not give a percentage of green space. Section I, page 4 says that a conceptual plan along with design and development standards will provide a framework and shall be generally consistent with the framework set out in the conceptual plan. We need a little better framework. There is a conceptual plan with roads on it, but the petitioner does not want to be held to the conceptual plan, only bits and pieces of the Ordinance. It just seems like a free ticket with no boundaries.

Lighting: This is a big issue. If cut-off/shut down could be utilized, that would be great.

Page 12, 1-8-1. General Street Standards: Again, this is a major concern with the size of the streets that they are just too narrow. It would be disastrous for a fire to go into the next neighborhood or something to that extent because the trucks could not get through. No more traffic than the street can handle should be allowed—once the child is hit, sorry does not make the hurt or pain go away and we prefer not to have that happen first.

Paragraph 1-8-4, paragraph 2. The setbacks of five feet seem narrow because the bay windows, bow windows, balconies, landscape can extend into that area—a change has not been noted here. A setback of 10 feet in a residential area is not a lot.

Again, the project as proposed to exit into the Auman neighborhood will drastically and negatively affect the entire Auman/Newark neighborhood.

Ms. Molt was to provide copies of her email comments for the committee and the file.

Madeleine Torres asked if there was open dialogue between Buckingham and the Auman Addition.

Ms. Molt responded in the negative. Ms. Molt said that the bone to pick is not with Buckingham but with the City to protect the residents' interests; the City limits the height of buildings and controls the density, the City governs the uses. Ms. Molt would like to see this worked out and compromises made, but in its current state, it cannot go in this area.

John Sullivan, The Enclave HOA president, agreed that the project lacks specificity and agreed with Mark Rattermann. Hopefully, by the time the Commission is finished with this, it will be specific. Mr. Sullivan has had dialogue with David Leazenby and it is at a stalemate. It IS up to the City of Carmel. We moved here because of the type of City it was. The PUD states that their Ordinance should over-ride the City Ordinance of Carmel—it should not. PUD's do not have to be written to do that. Here is a development in the middle of the City that is expected to grow to possibly 75,000 people. This development is right in the middle of a City—its Ordinance, its rules, its laws should not over-ride the City of Carmel. The Enclave residents are unanimously in favor of re-developing the apartments; we see the problems that are there. There is nothing in the PUD that requires that the elimination of these apartments take place. Mr. Sullivan suggested a provision be included in the PUD that for every 5 residential units built, one apartment should be taken down. Mr. Leazenby inferred that Buckingham did not want to do that. The last thing the residents want is this entire development, up to 2,000 residential units, with commercial at the south end, some commercial in the middle, and then simply have the developer walk away from the project. The law should prevent them from doing that—if they are halfway through the construction, we should require them to post bond if the apartment buildings are not torn down—a PUD can require them to post bond. There should not be one shovel of dirt turned in the development until there is either access to Carmel Drive or Keystone. There will be construction traffic not only from Gramercy but from the City Center as well, and there will be no relief from construction traffic—none has been offered. We don't want the commercial traffic from Gramercy coming onto 126th Street under ANY circumstance, period, ever! It is wrong for them to be able to build 10-story office buildings and come out one little outlet or maybe two. It is even morally wrong for them to be able to use the access on 126th Street, drive east on 126th Street and shut us off from going anyplace. It is a good example of corporate greed. The developer told the school board this is designed primarily for empty-nesters and in the PUD, they want an exception for schools—Why? There is no explanation. Don't make these special uses in the PUD, just take them out! Mr. Sullivan said that turning left from The Enclave onto 126th Street is impossible. However, a simple way to do it would be to shut the Mohawk entrance, go to the next entrance west and make a small round-about so that traffic from The Enclave could go to the round-about and come back to the east to Keystone. It would be much safer. Remember, with a 12-year build-out, traffic will be 12 years of torture for the residents.

Leo Dierckman asked that the petitioner put together a package up to this point and distribute to the Committee members—a packet should also be made available to Ms. Molt. The petitioner said they would get the package together and submit next Tuesday.

John Molitor reminded the public and the Committee that **once this Docket leaves Committee and returns to the full Commission, the public hearing is closed.** Once this item is sent on to S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudies/2006may18specialmtg

11

Council, whether with a favorable or unfavorable recommendation, the City Council will hold a public hearing and will probably send it to a Committee as well.

Docket No. 05120025 Z, 126th & Keystone/Gramercy PUD was continued to the June 6, 2006 Special Studies Committee meeting at 6:00 PM in the Chambers, subject to availability.

There was no further business for discussion and the Committee adjourned at 9:05 PM.

Leo Dierckman, Chairperson

Ramona Hancock, Secretary